

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Binkerton.

The claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Etani.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicant has amended claim 1, the broadest claim on file, so as to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

Before the analysis of the prior art it is believed to be advisable to explain to the Examiner the new features of the present invention as defined now in claim 1.

Claim 1 specifically defines a device for introducing substances into water in which a connecting element is provided for connecting a tubular element to a water source. The connecting element is specifically designed so

that it has a first portion which extends over and behind a radially outwardly projecting flange of the tubular element in a direction away from the second portion, while the second portion has an inner surface provided with an inner thread, and the first portion has a greater diameter than the outer diameter of the tubular element but a smaller diameter than the outer diameter of the flange and is freely rotatable on the tubular element.

Turning now to the references and in particular to the Pinkerton, it can be seen that this reference has a connecting element which connects a ... to the connecting element ... and which extends ... perpendicularly, located over a radially projecting flange of the tubular element and behind the radially projecting flange in a direction away from the second portion and having an inner diameter which is greater than the outer diameter of the tubular element but smaller than the outer diameter of the flange and also rotatable on the tubular element, with the second portion extending from the first portion and having an inner thread on its inner surface.

Thus, it is believed to be clear that the patent to Pinkerton does not teach the new features of the present invention as now defined in the amended claim 1.

that it has a first portion which extends over and behind a radially outwardly projecting flange of the tubular element in a direction away from the second portion, while the second portion has an inner surface provided with an inner thread, and the first portion has a greater diameter than the outer diameter of the tubular element but a smaller diameter than the outer diameter of the flange and is freely rotatable on the tubular element.

Turning now to the references and in particular to the Pinkerton, it can be seen that this reference has a connecting element which connects a tubular element to the source of water. However, the reference does not teach the new features of the present invention as now defined in the amended claim

1. There is no connecting element which has a first portion extending perpendicularly, located over a radially projecting flange of the tubular element and behind the radially projecting flange in a direction away from the second portion and having an inner diameter which is greater than the outer diameter of the tubular element but smaller than the outer diameter of the flange and also rotatable on the tubular element, with the second portion extending from the first portion and having an inner thread on its inner surface.

Thus, it is believed to be clear that the patent to Pinkerton does not teach the new features of the present invention as now defined in the amended claim 1.

The patent to Etani has been also considered. This reference also discloses a connecting which however is different from the connecting element of the present invention. It also does not have the new features of the present invention as now defined in the amended claim 1.

The original claims in the present application were rejected over each of these references under 35 U.S.C. 102. The references however do not teach the new features of the present invention as now defined in the amended claim 1. In connection with this, it is believed to be advisable to cite the decision in re Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) in which it was stated:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Definitely, the references do not contain each and every element of the present invention as now defined in the amended claim 1.

Therefore it is believed that the anticipation rejection applied against the original claims should be considered as not tenable with respect to the amended claim 1 and should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

The same is true with respect to claim 10 which is the second independent claim.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on the independent claims, they share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-243-3818).

Please extend the fee  
by 1 month and  
charge to 26 QOFS

Respectfully submitted,

Ilya Zborovsky  
Agent for Applicant  
Reg. No. 28563